

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/797,744	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ELY, ZACAY	
	<b>Examiner</b> Ernest F. Karlsen	<b>Art Unit</b> 2829	

**All Participants:**

(1) Ernest F. Karlsen.

(2) Maier Fenster.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 5 July 2006

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*none*

**Claims discussed:**

*1, 14, 19*

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*none*


**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner called Mr. Fenster and stated that claim 1 was allowable and that a restriction would be made between a first invention defined by claims 1-13, a second invention defined by claims 14-18 and a third invention defined by claims 19 and 20 and claims 1-13 would be elected by prior presentation. The Examiner further indicated that nonelected claims 14-20 could be cancelled by Examiner's Amendment for being drawn to non-elected inventions and the application issued or a letter could be mailed giving Applicant 30 days to petition the restriction or otherwise respond. Mr. Fenster made a counter proposal to make claims 14-20 dependent on claim 1 so that claims 14-20 would include all of the limitations of an allowed claim. The proposal was accepted by the Examiner and is reflected in the accompanying Examiner's Amendment. .

  
ERNEST KARLSEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER